



THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
Department of Agricultural Resources
**State Reclamation and
Mosquito Control Board**
251 Causeway Street, Suite 500
Boston, MA 02114-2151
<http://www.mass.gov/agr/mosquito/index.htm>



MITT ROMNEY
Governor

KERRY HEALEY
Lt. Governor

Mark S. Buffone, Chairman
Department of Agricultural Resources
Mike Gildesgame
Department of Conservation & Recreation
Gary P. Gonyea
Department of Environmental Protection

STEPHEN R. PRITCHARD
EOEA Secretary

DOUGLAS P. GILLESPIE
MDAR Commissioner

Donna Mitchell
Projects Administrator
Tel: (617) 626-1715
Fax: (617) 626-1850

STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD MINUTES/SUMMARY

WHO: State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board (SRMCB)
DATE: November 7, 2005
WHERE: Notch Visitor's Center, Holyoke Range, Route 116, Amherst, MA

PRESENT: Representing

State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board

Mark Buffone, SRMCB, Chairman
Charlie Burnham, SRMCB, Member
Gary Gonyea, SRMCB, Member
Donna Mitchell, SRMCB, Projects Administrator

Mosquito Control Project Commissions

David Colburn, Berkshire County Mosquito Control Commission

Mosquito Control Directors/Superintendents

Wayne Andrews, Bristol County Mosquito Control Project
Tim Deschamps, Central Mass Mosquito Control Project
Jake Jurgenson, Berkshire County Mosquito Control Project
Tim McGlinchy, Central Mass Mosquito Control Project
Walt Montgomery, Northeast Mass Mosquito Control and Wetlands District
Gabrielle Sakolsky, Cape Cod Mosquito Control Project
Robert "Bob" Thorndike, Plymouth County Mosquito Control Project

Others: NONE

STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD NOVEMBER 7, 2005 MINUTES

Introduction

Chairman Mark Buffone officially called the meeting of the State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board to order at 10:30 AM on Monday, November 7th 2005 taking place in Amherst. MA. Chairman Buffone remarked that this was the first time we have ventured out this far West for this meeting. He was not sure if we would be back but thanked Charlie Burnham whose office is close by for making the arrangements for this location.

For the record, the Chairman noted that this meeting had been filed with the Secretary of State and the Executive office of Administration and Finance in accordance with the General Laws of Massachusetts.

The Chair expressed a hardy welcomed to those that traveled this way for the meeting.

The Chairman acknowledged the other Board members present, Charlie Burnham representing the Department of Conservation and Recreation, and Gary Gonyea, representing the Department of Environmental Protection and in doing so he noted that there was a quorum.

Those present were asked to complete the sign-up sheet as it was passed around the room to insure an accurate account of who were present.

Agenda Item #1: Introductory Remarks

The Chairman stated that unless any of the Board members and others present, had any introductory remarks, he would forego his introductory remarks and proceed immediately to agenda item 2 which called for approval of the minutes of the last meeting of the SRMCB on June 15th, 2005

Item 1 Questions and Discussion:

NONE

Item 1 Action Taken:

Chairman Buffone proceeded to agenda item 2.

Agenda Item #2: Approval of June 15, 2005 Minutes

Background:

Chairman Buffone noted that the minutes of June 15, 2005 was in order and entertained a motion to approve them as written.

Questions and Discussion:

NONE

Action Taken:

Charlie Burnham made a motion to approve the June 15, 2005 minutes as written and Gary Gonyea seconded the motion. Hearing no discussion, the vote to approve the minutes of June 15, 2005 carried unanimously.

Agenda Item # 3: Vote to approve slate of Commissioners appointments and re-appointment

Background:

Chairman Buffone read aloud a proposed slate of mosquito control Commissioner appointments that have been recommended for approval as seen below.

**PROPOSED SLATE OF MOSQUITO CONTROL COMMISSIONER
RECOMMENDED FOR APPOINTMENT AND RE-APPOINTMENTS**

Re-Appointments

<i>Name</i>	<i>Mosquito Control District</i>	<i>Expiration Date</i>
David Colburn	Berkshire	11/30/2008
James Quirk Jr.	Cape Cod	11/30/2008
Richard Pollack	Norfolk	11/30/2010

New Appointments

<i>Name</i>	<i>Mosquito Control District</i>	<i>Expiration Date</i>
Christine A. Fagan	Bristol	11/30/2007

**STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD NOVEMBER 7, 2005
MINUTES**

J. Gregory Milne	Cape Cod	11/30/2009
Robin L. Chapell	Norfolk	11/30/2008

Questions and Discussion:

Gary Gonyea asked the Chair if we should provisionally approve those Commissioners who could not make the scheduled interviews because of medical and personal reasons. Chairman Buffone replied that it was his opinion that legislation establishing districts permits Commissioners to continue to serve in a formal capacity until the qualifications of their respective successor is appointed even if the Commissioner term had expired. The Chairman stated that the SRMCB would do its best to interview those Commissioners whose terms have expired as soon as possible. Finally, Chairman Buffone mentioned that the SRMCB needed to work harder to fill current vacancies at both the Suffolk County Mosquito Control Project and the Northeast Mosquito Control and Wetlands Management District. Chairman Buffone encouraged those present to forward names of any individuals that might be interested in becoming Commissioners. The SRMCB would send out another mailing to the cities and towns where vacancies currently exist encouraging individuals to apply.

With no further discussion, Chairman Buffone entertained a motion to approve and accept the slate of those candidates recommended who have successfully completed the SRMCB's appointment process. Once again Chairman Buffone expressed that he continues to enjoy the relatively new interview process whereby the SRMCB has a chance to meet Candidates and Commissioners. He remarked that the SRMCB has received many good ideas as a result and appreciated the effort these individuals made to be present for interviews.

Action Taken:

Gary Gonyea made a motion to approve the slate of mosquito control Commissioners recommended for appointments and re-appointments as read aloud by the Chairman. Charlie Burnham seconded the motion. Hearing no discussion, the vote to approve the slate of recommendations carried unanimously. Chairman Buffone commented that he would, mail out the necessary paperwork by the end of the week, that being letters and certificates of appointments specifying terms of appointment, and requiring candidates to accept appointment as well as requiring appointees to have certificates of appointment notarized and returned to the Board. For new appointments, a letter would be sent to the Chairman of the applicable mosquito control commission of this action so that the new individuals can be welcomed.

Agenda Item #4: Vote to approve Mosquito Misting Systems Position Statement

Background:

Chairman Buffone explained that this agenda item was not new and that in fact it appeared on the October 6, 2004 meeting agenda under "Other Business (staying ahead of the curve)".

He mentioned that he placed this item on the table because of its impact on how mosquito control is done in Massachusetts and it was in his opinion an issue that would eventually need to be addressed for the foreseeable future.

In particular, the issue of mosquito misting systems was something that was evoking concern since it appeared to be a growing industry in the United States (US) (selling mosquito misting systems in response to the recent West Nile Virus problems) especially in the Southern and Western parts of the US

Chairman Buffone stated that he was not currently aware if companies have been established in Northeast. However, Chairman Buffone mentioned that American Mosquito Control Association (AMCA) and other groups such as Pesticide Regulatory Agencies have expressed concern as well essentially stating that such systems should be discouraged since they were unregulated and not very effective. The Chairman remarked that the Board should go "on record" that we do not believe these systems are effective and represent something contrary to current mosquito control standards here in Massachusetts. Therefore, he proposed a draft position statement as seen below to be approved by the SRMCB.

Mosquito Misting Systems Position Statement

With the recent emergence of West Nile Virus (WNV) and concerns about mosquito borne illness in general, a growing industry has emerged offering various solutions to control mosquitoes. In particular, mosquito-misting systems have been promoted as both a commercial and residential solution to mosquito problems.

According to Pest Control Technology News dated October 21, 2005, "these systems are typically installed in the eaves of residential and commercial properties and dispense a fine mist of adulticides during the time of day in which mosquitoes are active. Their purpose is to reduce the population of mosquitoes in the area immediately adjacent to the treatment." Also, the news item further stated "that since the emergence of the technology, state and federal regulators have expressed a number of regulatory concerns about the systems, including advertising claims made by the companies that manufacture, distribute and install the systems, concerns about human exposure to the pesticides dispensed by the systems, effects on non-target species, increased resistance to adulticides, licensing, certification and training of individuals selling and installing the systems and issues related to the storage and disposal of pesticides dispensed by the systems."

**STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD NOVEMBER 7, 2005
MINUTES**

The State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board (SRMCB) has considered the issue of Mosquito Misting Systems (MMS) and the concerns expressed about them. Our position is in agreement with the position held by the American Mosquito Control Association (AMCA) and the concerns of others such as Pesticide Regulatory Officials.

In particular, the SRMCB cites the following statement by Roger S. Nasci, Ph.D. President of the American Mosquito Control Association (AMCA) in a letter dated June 29, 2004 to Director James J. Jones of the Office of Pesticide Programs in Washington, D.C.

"In summary the AMCA position is that the automated interval misting systems are not consistent with sound practices to promote public and environmental health and should be discouraged. We request the USEPA support this position and take appropriate action to limit the use of these products for mosquito control."

The SRMCB recognizes and supports the use of pesticides to suppress mosquitoes when based on an Integrated Mosquito Management (IMM, it does not support the indiscriminate and unmonitored use of pesticides to reduce mosquito populations.

At this time, the SRMCB view these systems as contrary to IMM and regional approach to mosquito suppression. Further, the SRMCB question the effectiveness of such systems from the perspective of annoyance alleviation and reduction of risks associated with mosquito-borne diseases.

If and when research indicates that these systems are effective or regulatory restrictions are applied, the SRMCB could revise its policy. Until such time, the SRMCB, as the agency responsible for overseeing mosquito control in Massachusetts, does not support, recommend, nor approve the use of mosquito misting systems to control mosquitoes in Massachusetts.

Questions and Discussion:

NONE

Action Taken:

Charlie Burnham made a motion to accept and approve the mosquito control misting position draft statement as written and Gary Gonyea seconded the motion. Hearing no discussion, the vote to approve this position statement carried unanimously.

Agenda Item # 5: Sexual Harassment and Workplace Violence Mandatory Training

Background:

Chairman Buffone explained that this item was placed on the agenda because the Commonwealth's Policy on sexual harassment and workplace violence stipulates that all state employees must be trained in the policy. Essentially we have been told that this training is mandatory and that all mosquito control employees (as state employees) under the SRMCB needed to receive training to bring them into full compliance with the commonwealth's policy

To provide for a more convenient situation instead of going to trainings set up in Boston the Chairman stated that he requested that mosquito folks be allowed to attend at a later time. This was necessary since the one remaining training scheduled for November 28th in Boston conflicted with the Annual Northeast Mosquito Control Meeting that most mosquito control professionals and SRMCB members attend.

The Chairman was unable to announce a specific date for the training but did remarked that it would be held at the Waltham Field Station and run from 9 AM -1 PM. He also mentioned that the cost of the training would be \$22 dollars and each district would be invoiced after the training. The training is applicable to full time employees only and does not affect seasonal employees. However, Chairman Buffone strongly encouraged that seasonal employees receive and sign off on the fact that they were given these policies to read prior to employment. The Chairman added that Jean C. Haertl Director, Workplace Violence Prevention, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Human Resources Division would be the trainer.

Finally, Chairman Buffone recognized that several if not all mosquito control districts have a sexual harassment and workplace violence policy but believed that all employees of each district still attend nonetheless and thereby have the SRMCB on record as directing all mosquito control full time employees to attend.

Chairman Buffone for the record remarked that districts were sent the sexual harassment policy, the policy for the prohibition of domestic violence, and the incident management process for workplace violence. He also wanted to mention that one district did send their policy to him on sexual harassment, which was forward to the Department of Agricultural Resources Human Resources Director for review. Although the reviewed policy had some minor edits such as adding information about notification (i.e. if there is a problem, call the following person and name, phone, Chairman Buffone commented that a district should follow the state policy even if they have their own policy but it effect the state policy is the overriding policy.

Questions and Discussion:

NONE

Action Taken:

Chairman Buffone will secure a date for the mandatory training and notify all parties.

Agenda Item # 6: Non-Member Municipalities Discussion and Policy

Background:

Chairman Buffone placed this item on the agenda for purposes of discussion. One of the things that the SRMCB would like to do is to send out a letter to non-member communities introducing the SRMCB to them, identify the current members, state where the SRMCB authority comes from, and the fact that they need to send in their programs to the SRMCB for approval.

This would be a 2006 effort to Board of Health and /or Selectman in non-member communities. These cities and town would be told that if they are doing mosquito control or plan to in 2006, the SRMCB need to review and approve their plan. This project would enable the Board to illustrate where mosquito control is being done outside current regional efforts. At the same time, the letter will mention the arbovirus issues, which has created some situation where non-member communities have requested assistance/service from a mosquito control district because of the virus threat. The idea discussed was to send them information on their options for mosquito control. Chairman Buffone opened it up to a full discussion with those present.

Questions and Discussion:

Gary mentioned that it was a good idea to do this to find out what efforts if any these communities are performing. If they are doing mosquito control, we should make sure they are performing minimal best management standards.

One issue discussed is that many communities that could need or request service were far removed geographically from the established set ups using Berkshire County as an example. Most communities served by regional mosquito control are in the eastern third of the state.

It was agreed that there are perhaps a few if any private companies that perform mosquito control services and thus those communities who are not members depending geographically where they are located request from established district to help them. However, the district may be too far away geographically or the district owns needs take precedence.

Gary believed this issue only affected in recent times Central and Northeast districts and indicated that member equipment and personnel have been used on an as needed basis, performing the service, and then follow-up with the town to ask them to consider joining to avoid such dilemma in the future. Districts such as the Northeast have done it but as a one time only basis and the city/town pay for the service up front and accept all liability of pesticide applications. Another expressed concerned during the discussion was that under Chapter 252, mosquito districts have no authority to operate in any community that is not a full member.

Action Taken:

Chairman Buffone ask if the districts could forward their policies are on this issue so that the SRMCB could review them to avoid issues that arose in 2005. He commented that he would like to see a standard that is followed for all non-member communities.

STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD NOVEMBER 7, 2005 MINUTES

The SRMCB could make a blanket authorization so that districts would feel more comfortable if requested to perform services in a non-member community. Gary Gonyea stated that a good recommendation would be if any district gets a request for service forward to the SRMCB along with the mosquito Commissions recommendations as to what needs to be done. Thereafter, the SRMCB can make a decision and authorize the district so that they have the authority to go into a non-member community. However, the standard would be that we do not usually do this and stipulate that this is a one shot deal and need to consider other joining programs and conducting other mosquito control options. That should be part of the recommendation from the district if the request comes to us so that the SRMCB can weigh in with the district.

If and when conditions arise, you are operating under the authority of 252. Also, Gary Gonyea pointed out correctly that we need to look at these request on a case-by-case basis citing the situation of summer 2005 as an example. He commented that we had our own problems and we would have been unable to respond to non-member communities without straining existing resources.

The SRMCB would like to support or help neighboring communities even states as has happened in the past but it depends on the current need of existing member communities. The SRMCB will look to the mosquito control Commissions to help the SRMCB understand what the district capacity is as it relates to servicing non-member communities in unique public health circumstances.

For the record, the SRMCB policy is that we do not operate in non-member communities except in emergency situations for public health purpose and only on a case-by-case basis, along with written agreement that the non-member community would need to meet specific conditions established by the SRMCB and the particular mosquito control project.

Agenda item # 7: Budgets

Background:

Chairman Buffone wanted to remind those in attendance about the budget policy and asked Donna Mitchell, Projects Administrator to give a summary on current budget status especially rollover monies. This issue surfaced when the state was looking for funds to pay for a potential emergency aerial application. Rollover monies were noted and identified for this purpose but an explanation was needed to help those looking for funding that these monies had been earmarked for expenditure.

The SRMCB support rollover amounts and understand that they are justified due to how the fiscal year of the state falls in the middle of mosquito season. However, the Chairman caution districts to only carry forward amounts that were reasonable.

Donna Mitchell explained further to the SRMCB using a graph explaining the budget amounts and how Commissions approved expenditures. She entertained questions too.

Chairman mentioned that the SRMCB would be again certifying budgets in May.

STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD NOVEMBER 7, 2005 MINUTES

Questions and Discussion:

Along with these budget discussions, Donna proposed that the SRMCB should purchase cell phones for its members and lap top computer for the SRMCB. These items would be expended from funds in the administration budget. Gary Gonyea and Charlie Burnham and all present were in agreement that this expenditure was justified and would have been especially useful last summer when EEE and WNV situations took place.

Action Taken:

The SRMCB agreed that it was advantageous for Board members to have cell phones and a lap top computer for daily use but especially for emergency and travel situations.

Agenda item # 8: 2005 Mosquito Season Discussion and ideas for 2006

Background:

Chairman Buffone stated that he placed this item in the agenda to encourage input from those present. He noted that many of those in attendance today were at the DPH meeting on October 19th where workgroups have been established to plan for 2006.

Questions and Discussion:

Chairman Buffone stated that he was not a proponent of the phased response approach outlined by DPH and commented that all options should be on the table. Depending on the situation, you select the most meaningful option. Otherwise, the Chairman stated that if you wait for human cases to appear before consideration of selecting an option, it might be too late if the objective is to prevent human morbidity and mortality.

Chairman Buffone commented that the SRMCB was proposing its own plan in terms of response and asked those present for input.

Several ideas were suggested that the SRMCB should endorse CDC guidelines, which although is a phased plan, the response triggers are activated sooner. It was recognized that as soon as you have evidence of virus in a human biting mosquito, human cases can occur that day or shortly thereafter.

A discussion took place that if you have virus isolations before August 1st in mosquitoes other than “*Culiseta melanura*”, one must seriously look at that situation and take immediate action with additional traps and mosquito adulticide use in these areas. Sustained isolations such as isolating virus again within a week with evidence of a continuing increase of Minimum Infection Rates (MIR) should be another trigger that calls for rapid response of intervention.

**STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD NOVEMBER 7, 2005
MINUTES**

Many comments were expressed and a small brainstorming session occurred about areas that should be treated, the fact that the time for the decisions to made along the hierarchal ladder could hurt the chances of making a positive public health impact, and the issue of spraying school property and unintended consequences of notification about pesticide use such the public having more concern about the pesticides than the fact that mosquitoes are infected.

Action Taken:

SRMCB would propose a plan of what needs to be done to be prepared for 2006.

Agenda item # 9: Vote on 2006 Meeting Date schedule

Background:

Chairman Buffone commented that the SRMCB voted to establish a pre-set schedule at the beginning of the New Year for the months of January, March, June, and October on the second Wednesday of each month and as needed. Although, the SRMCB has had to make changes, the Chair still proposed the following dates.

Questions and Discussion:

The following schedule was proposed for the SRMCB to meet in Waltham on February 8th, June 7th, November 8th, with modification as necessary.

Action Taken:

Gary Gonyea moved that the proposed dates be accepted and Charlie Burnham seconded the motion and the vote carried unanimously.

Agenda item # 10: Adjournment

Background:

NONE

Questions and Discussion:

NONE

Action Taken:

Charlie Burnham made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 12:08 PM and seconded by Gary Gonyea and the vote carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted: